303-786-7691

CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 1 9 2006

PTO/SB/21 (09-04) Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Under the Paper Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM			Application Number	10/750 440					
				10/760,440					
			Filing Date	Jan 20, 2004					
			First Named Inventor	Hanson, George E.					
			Art Unit	2838					
(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)			Examiner Name	A. Berhane					
Total Number of Pages in This Submission 6			Attorney Docket Number	03-1597					
ENCLOSURES (Check off the comple)									
ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)									
Fee Tra	a Transmittal Form			Drawing(s)		After Allo	owance Communication to TC		
Fee Attached			Licensing-related Papers	Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences					
Amendment / Reply			Petition		X Appeal	Communication to TC Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)			
After Final			Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application		Propriet	ary Information			
Affidavits/declaration(s)			Provisional Application Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Ac	ridress	Status L	_etter			
Extension of Time Request			Terminal Disclaimer		X Other En	ndosure(s) (please			
Express Abandonment Request				Request for Refund	•	identity i	Delowy.		
Information Disclosure Statement				CD, Number of CD(s)					
				Landscape Table on CD					
Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)			I Bom	parke l					
Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application			Requ	Remarks Request for Pre-Appeal Brief Review					
Reply to Missing Parts						•			
		FR 1.52 or 1.53							
	-	SIGN	ATURE	OF APPLICANT, ATTORI	NEY, OR	AGENT			
Firm Name	Duft B	omsen & Fishman	1	> /	· · · · ·				
Signature Signature									
Printed name	fully ag								
Date	May 19, 2006			Reg. No. 355		35512			
		C	ERTIF	ICATE OF TRANSMISSIO	N/MAILII	NG			
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.									
Signature / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / /									
Typed or printed	name	Daniel Fishman	/			Date	May 19, 2006		

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

In you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

RECEIVED

Application Serial No. : 10/760,440 CENTRAL FAX CENTER

Filed : 20 January 2004

Applicants : G. Hanson MAY 1 9 2006

Title : Dual AC and DC Input DC Power Supply

Art Unit : 2838

Examiner : A. Berhane
Docket Number : 03-1597
Date : 19 May 2006

Mail Stop AF Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REQUEST FOR PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REVIEW

Sir:

In response to the Final Office Action mailed 10 March 2006, in conjunction with the Notice of Appeal filed herewith, and in accordance with the procedure outlined in OG Notices (12 July 2005), please consider the following remarks.

No amendment is being submitted with this request. This request is filed concurrently with a Notice of Appeal. Applicants hereby request review of the final rejection in the above-identified matter for the reasons stated herein below.

Reasons for Requested Review

The Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of anticipation or obviousness.

The Examiner reads Matsushita as teaching all elements of the claimed invention but for the use of a full wave rectifier. The Examiner then posits that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to replace the rectifier of Matsushita with a full wave rectifier. Applicants have exhaustively pointed out inconsistencies in the Examiner's reading of the claimed invention on the structure of Matsushita and have pointed to several structural distinctions between Matsushita and the claimed invention but to no avail.

In this most recent pending final office action, the Examiner seeks to clarify his reading of the claims and Matsushita as follows:

Applicant's attention is directed to Fig. 1 which examiner would not only identify the elements with the claimed language but also with Applicant's Fig. 3. Applicant's Fig. 3 elements are identified with Matsushita element. Applicant's element 102 (Matsushita's 21), DC input (26), filter 140 (32), driver circuit 341 (39), switches 34 (41), transformer 343 (22), rectifier 142 (48) and capacitor C1 (49). With respect to Fig. 1 of Matsushita patent, a DC output stage that outputs a predetermined DC electrical power (25), an AC input stage (21) connected to the DC output stage (25), with the AC input stage (21) configured to convert AC electrical power at the AC input stage into the predetermined DC electrical power (21) available at the DC output stage, a DC input stage (26) connected to the DC output stage, with the DC input stage configured to convert DC electrical power at the DC input stage into the predetermined DC electrical power (50) available at the DC output stage, the DC output stage comprises at least one capacitor (49) across a DC positive output terminal and a DC ground output terminal (25), an AC sense circuit (8) that detects AC electrical power at the AC input stage, the DC input stage (30) comprises a DC input stage disable line connected to the AC sense circuit, and wherein the DC input stage disable line (34) disables outputting the predetermined DC electrical power from the DC input stage when the AC sense circuit detects AC electrical power at the AC input stage, a switching circuit (69) that receives the DC electrical power and that is configured to generate a substantially AC waveform at a first AC voltage level from the DC electrical power, a transformer (22) connected to the switching circuit and configured to convert the substantially AC waveform at the first AC voltage level to a second AC voltage level; and a rectifier (48) connected to the transformer and configured to convert the substantially AC waveform at the second AC voltage level to the predetermined DC electrical power, a buffer stage (15 & 41) connected to the switching circuit and configured to provide electrical current to the substantially AC waveform. Matsushita teach the use of a full wave rectifier in Fig. 4 (3 and 4).

Expressing these elements in tabular form for ease of reading, the Examiner finds the claimed elements of claim 1 (for example) as follows:

Claim 1 elements	Matsushita FIG. 1 element
a DC output stage that outputs a predetermined DC electrical power;	25
an AC input stage connected to the DC output stage, with the AC input stage configured to convert AC electrical power at the AC input stage into the predetermined DC electrical power available at the DC output stage; and	21
a DC input stage connected to the DC output stage, with the DC input stage configured to convert DC electrical power at the DC input stage into the predetermined DC electrical power available at the DC output stage wherein the DC input stage further comprises:	26
a switching circuit that receives the DC electrical power and that is configured to generate a substantially AC waveform at a first AC voltage level from the DC electrical power;	69
a transformer connected to the switching circuit and configured to convert the substantially AC waveform at the first AC voltage level to a second AC voltage level; and	22
a full-wave rectifier connected to the transformer and configured to convert the substantially AC waveform at the second AC voltage level to the predetermined DC electrical power.	48

Key to the Examiner's reading is that the claimed DC input stage reads on battery 26 of Matsushita. However, this reading simply ignores the recited structure of claim 1. For example, the recited AC input stage must be "configured to convert AC electrical power at the AC input stage into the predetermined DC electrical power available at the DC output stage". RCC type switching circuit 21 of Matsushita performs no such conversion. Further, the recited DC input stage of claim 1 is "configured to convert DC electrical power at the DC input stage into the predetermined DC electrical power available at the DC output stage". Battery 26 of Matsushita is not so configured. Still further, the recited DC input stage of claim 1 is recited as further comprising a switching circuit, a transformer, and a rectifier. Battery 26 of Matsushita has no such further

elements. The Examiner finds these features in Matsushita's FIG. 1 as switching circuit 69, transformer 22, and rectifier 48. These elements are not part of battery 26 of Matsushita as in the recited structure of claim 1 and fail to provide the recited feature of the DC input stage to provide a predetermined DC electrical power to the DC output stage. The DC output stage is read by the Examiner as secondary drive circuit 25 of Matsushita. While it is true that secondary drive circuit 25 of Matsushita does output DC electrical power, the structure of Matsushita's drive circuit 25 receives AC electrical power through transformer 22 but the recited DC output stage receives DC electrical power.

These structural difference clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the teachings of the prior art but the Examiner has failed to even acknowledge the differences let alone address the differences in his office action. Applicants have pointed to these structural differences in a prior responses but the Examiner apparently fails to understand or even acknowledge the differences. Thus, the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of either anticipation or obviousness based on the prior art of record. Applicants therefore respectfully request this review panel to reverse the Examiner's position and either allow the claims as presently submitted or require a legally adequate office action be provided.

Applicants have submitted herewith a Notice of Appeal along with the appropriate fees therefore. Applicants believe no further fees are due in this matter. Should any issues remain, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel N. Fishman #35,512 Duft Bornsen & Fishman, LLP

1526 Spruce Street, Suite 302

Boulder, CO 80302 (303) 786-7687

(303) 786-7691 (fax)